CONTRACTS—BY-LAW OF CORPORATION—RESTRAINT OF COMPETITION.—Plaintiff corporation was formed by the farmers of Wray, Colorado, as stockholders, for the purpose of buying and selling their grain. A by-law of the company provides "the stockholders of this company may sell grain to competitors in Wray only, by paying to the secretary of the Wray Farmers' Grain Co., the sum of one cent per bushel for each bushel of grain sold, as his proportional share of the maintenance of the company". Under this by-law plaintiff sued defendant, a stockholder, for $35 for 3,500 bushels sold to plaintiff's competitor in Wray. *Held,* the by-law (which the court considered as a contract) was illegal because in restraint of competition. *Burns* v. *Wray Farmers' Grain Co.* (Colo., 1918), 176 Pac. 487.

By holding the above by-law illegal the court destroyed the effectiveness of this corporation which was a combination in restraint of trade. Similarly, combinations of this nature were invalidated in two Iowa cases on which the court in the instant case relied. *Reeves* v. *Decorah Farmers' Cooperative Society,* 160 Ia. 194; and *Ludovese* v. *Farmers' Mutual Cooperative Co.,* 164 Ia. 197. In the cases of *Slaughter* v. *Thacker Coal & Coke Co.,* 55 W. Va. 642, and *Pocahontas Coke Co.* v. *C. & C. Co.,* 60 W. Va. 508, contracts between the corporations and their members aimed to accomplish the same result as the by-law in the instant case; and they likewise were held illegal. Therefore, attempts to enforce such a combination either by contract or by-law appear to be futile. Combinations like that in the instant case are unlawful because they aim to confer the power to control prices. Neither avowed purposes of public service. *Detroit Salt Co.* v. *Nat. Salt Co.,* 134 Mich. 120; *Pocahontas Coke Co.* v. *C. & C. Co.,* 60 W. Va. 508; *Morris Run Coal Co.* v. *Barclay Coal Co.,* 68 Pa. 173; *Judd* v. *Harrington,* 139 N. Y. 105, nor is the actual accomplishment of results conducive to the public welfare sufficient to make them valid. 20 AM. & ENG. ENC. LAW 849; *Anheuser-Busch Brew. Assoc.* v. *Houck,* 27 S. W. 692; *People* v. *Sheldon,* 139 N. Y. 251.

COURTS—JURISDICTION OVER FOREIGN CORPORATIONS DOING BUSINESS IN THE STATE.—The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company had no railroad lines in Texas, and had no state permit to do business in the state. It did, however, maintain an office in Amarillo, Texas, near the border, from which the general manager of its Western lines, with the aid of a trainmaster, general foreman, mechanical superintendent, and a clerical force, directed the operation of its lines outside the state. *Held,* that the railway company was not doing business within the state so as to subject it to personal service of state process. *Atkinson, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co.* v. *Weeks* (U. S. Cir. Ct. of App., 5th Cir., 1918), 254 Fed. 513.

The case is of value as another application of the rule that "in order to render a corporation amenable to the service of process in a foreign jurisdiction, it must appear that the corporation is transacting business in that district to such an extent as to subject it to the jurisdiction and laws thereof".—*St. Louis Southwestern Ry. Co.* v. *Alexander,* 227 U. S. 218, 226. No rule more definite than this has been stated, and "each case of this kind must de-